



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST-NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/673,440	11/20/2000	Masato Shimakawa	450101-02342	5342
20999	7590	12/14/2004	EXAMINER	
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG 745 FIFTH AVENUE- 10TH FL. NEW YORK, NY 10151			PIERRE, MYRIAM	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2654	

DATE MAILED: 12/14/2004

5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

DT

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/673,440

Applicant(s)

SHIMAKAWA ET AL.

Examiner

Myriam Pierre

Art Unit

2654

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 November 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11-20-2000.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

The following title is suggested: Translating target language with input prediction.

2. The specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: "related information" page 4, and "check source language sentence", "status message", or "status explaining sentence", page 11 or "check information", "explain" or "explaining" (page 6-7). The specification is replete with terms which are not clear, concise and exact. The specification should be revised carefully.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 1-2, 4-5, 9-13, 15, 21-23, 26, 27, 31-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

6. The claims are generally narrative and indefinite, failing to conform with current U.S. practice. They appear to be a literal translation into English from a foreign document and are replete with grammatical and idiomatic errors. For example, in claim 1, "A translation which a translation information showing a correspondence..." should read "A translation using a translation information that shows a correspondence...". Moreover, "...target language sentence or part of a sentence and decides" should read "target language sentence or part of a sentence to decide". In claim 28, "...second input means for entering a sentence of a part..." should read "...second input means for entering a sentence or a part..."

Some examples of indefinite language are "related information" in claim 1, "response sentence prediction" in claim 8, "application constraint" in claim 9, "translation result candidate" in claim 10 and "field information" in claim 13.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-7, 9, 12, 14, 18-24, 26 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by **Franz (6,393,388)**.

As to claim 1, Franz teaches

teach a translation method which a translation information (**translation dictionary**) showing a correspondence between source language sentence or part of a sentence entered (**Fig 8A and col. 7, lines 64-65**) and a target language sentence or part of a sentence (**Fig. 10A**) and decides a coincidence or similarity between said source language sentence or part of a sentence (**"Detecting means" detects examples similar to syntax of first language, col. 6, lines 29-30**) and a sentence constructed by a combination of said translation information, so that source language sentence or part of a sentence is translated into target language sentence or part of a sentence (**Fig. 10A**);
wherein

translation information (**Examiner reads 'translation information' as "translation dictionary" which contains "converting part", Fig. 5, col. 10, lines 40 and**

44) contain descriptions of source language sentence or part of a sentence
(translation dictionary contains part of source language sentence, col. 10, lines 44) the corresponding target language sentence or part of a sentence
(translation dictionary has source language information needed to correspond to the target language sentence, col. 10, lines 40-45), and a related information (Examiner reads 'related information' as "converting part", along with all the input & output components to the converting part, see Fig. 5, steps 7-13) related to source language sentence or part of a sentence and target language sentence or part of a sentence ("Converting Part" relates phrase examples (steps 7-10) to the "simple syntax analyzing part" (step 6) via the "similarity degree calculating part" which relates source information to the translated information, Fig 5 steps 7-11 and col. 10, lines 61-65 and col. 11, lines 1-2);

As to claim 18, Franz teaches

input means for entering a sentence or part of a sentence of a source language

(Translating apparatus, input sentence, col. 8, lines 24 and 32);

storage means for storing a translation information containing a description of

correspondence between source language sentence or part of a sentence and a target sentence or part of a sentence as a translation of source language

sentence or part of a sentence(**“clause division pattern translation example memory” stores first language example and the corresponding translated language, col. 9, lines 1-5, Fig. 5**); and

a description of related information associated with source language sentence or part of a sentence and target language sentence or part of a sentence (**related information, or “converting part” is associated with first/source language and target language, col. 9, lines 16-20 and 45-50**);

analysis means for deciding, according to said translation information, a coincidence or similarity between said source language sentence or part of a sentence and a sentence constructed by a combination of translation information, thereby analyzing source language sentence or part of a sentence and generating a translation result candidate (**“Converting part” works with the “simple syntax analyzing part” which extracts grammar from first language, source language, and detects similar examples of first language to the phrase translation in memory, col. 10, lines 15-19**);

target language sentence generation means (**Fig 5, steps 8-10**) for generating target language sentence or part of a sentence as a translation of source language sentence or part of a sentence(**Generates second language from first language sentence structure/syntax, col. 6, lines 57-58**); and

output means for outputting target language sentence or part of a sentence generated by target language sentence generation means(**Outputs data with first language sentence, col. 8, lines 45**);.

As to claims 2 and 19, Franz teaches

related information is information, which supports interpretation of the

meaning (**concept, col. 11, lines 3-4**) of target language sentence or part of a sentence corresponding to source language sentence or part of a sentence entered (**“Converting part”/related information uses information from the “thesaurus memory”, which supports classifying or interpreting words from the first language to the second language based on concept, col. 11, lines 2-7**).

As to claims 3 and 20, Franz teaches

related information contains a check source language sentence as a variation of target

language sentence or part of a sentence corresponding to source language sentence or part of a sentence entered (**Examiner reads ‘check source language sentence’ as “word similarity”, which expresses the similarity or variation of the target language and input/first language, which is controlled by the “Converting Part”/related information, col. 15, lines 4-7, 36-40, and 44-46; and Fig. 7, steps 6-10**).

As to claims 4 and 21, Franz teaches

check source language sentence is omitted in translation information when source

language sentence or part of a sentence is identical to the check source language sentence to be described in the translation information (**Fig. 7 steps 8-9 are skipped or omitted when examples matching the first language to second language are stored, see Fig 7 steps 8-9).**

As to claims 5 and 22, Franz teaches

related information includes at least one of a status explaining sentence in said source language explaining a status where check source language sentence is used **(The ‘status explaining sentence’ on Fig 8A is in the source language called “root”, (‘check source language’ or “word similarity”) the example “ONEGAI SURU” corresponds to “ONEGAI SHITAI”, when there isn’t a direct match in phrases, it leads to modified examples of the input, the examples are in Fig 9A-9C, giving the user the possible examples from the root [ONEGAI SURU], col. 16, lines 64-67; and col. 17, lines 12-20, 25-27).**

As to claims 6 and 23, Franz teaches

related information is an information for correlating with a translation information related to a sentence or part of a sentence or part of source sentence of source language **(“converting part” similarity between words in first language or source language based on calculations col. 43, lines 51-55)** having a high possibility to be entered next to said source language sentence or part of a

sentence which has been entered (**source sentence collected based on previous input, Fig 5, col. 5, lines 54-55 and Fig. 9A-9C**)

As to claims 7 and 24, Franz teaches

related information is a field information (**Examiner reads the field information as the 'slot name values' which is in the 'modality case information' in Fig 8A, the 'slot name value' gives information to the converting part/related information, the information given to the converting part becomes the field information, col. 14, lines 56-65**)

for limiting a field of a sentence or part of a sentence of source language (**slot values [extended-predicate+] and [formal+] limit the sentence 'YOYAKU O SHITE ITADAKITAI NO DESU GA', to [gerund-suffix ITADUKU] and [desiderative+][s-part GA], col. 14, lines 56-60**)

having a high possibility to be entered next to source language sentence of part of a sentence which has been entered (**Fig 9A-9C example "root[ONEGAI SURU]" is used to give three possible next source languages entered, such as "may I have/speak to NP1", the NP1 are the next possible source language sentences, "may I have coffee" or "may I speak to NP1" or "may I have NP1").**

As to claims 9 and 26, Franz teaches

related information is an application constraint used in deciding a coincidence or

similarity between said source language sentence or part of a sentence entered and a sentence constructed by a combination of translation information (**The “Converting Part” or related information, which acts as an ‘application constraint’ by conduction the “similarity degree calculating part” which computes “translation suit-abilities” or similarities between the first/source language and the translation information, or examples that are stored, col. 15, lines 37-47).**

As to claim 12, Franz teaches

related information is an information for correlating to the translation information

associated with sentence or part of a sentence of target language (**“Converting Part” relates phrase examples (steps 7-10) to the “simple syntax analyzing part” (step 6) via the “similarity degree calculating part” which relates source information to the translated information, Fig 5 steps 7-11 and col. 10, lines 61-65 and col. 11, lines 1-2)**

having a high possibility to be entered next as a response to source language sentence

or part of a sentence which has been entered (**Fig 9A-9C example**

“root[ONEGAI SURU]” is used to give three possible next source languages entered, such as “may I have/speak to NP1”, the NP1 are the next possible source language sentences, “may I have coffee” or “may I speak to NP1” or “may I have NP1”).

As to claim 14, Franz teaches

source language sentence or part of sentence is entered in voice and recognized and target language sentence or part of a sentence is entered in voice and recognized (**source language sentence is first language is entered as speech or text, which is translated and outputted in the same way entered, as speech or text, col. 8, lines 37-39).**

As to claim 31, Franz teaches

related information (**Examiner reads 'related information' as "converting part", along with all the input & output components to the converting part, see Fig. 5, steps 7-13).**

voice recognition means for recognizing sentence or part of a sentence of source language entered in voice by input means, wherein output means outputs in voice target language sentence or part of a sentence generated as a translation of source language sentence or part of a sentence (**source language sentence is first language, if input uses a speech recognition device then the outputted translation responds the same way that it is entered, col. 8, lines 37-39).**

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 8, 16-17, 28, 31, and 33-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Franz (6,393,388) as applied to claims 1 and 18 above, and further in view of Sukeda (5,854,977).**

As to claims 8 and 25,

Franz teaches related information (**Examiner reads 'related information' as "converting part", along with all the input & output components to the converting part, see Fig. 5, steps 7-13).**

Franz does not teach of response sentence that predicts a response to the source language.

However, Sukeda teaches of a response sentence predicting a response to said source language sentence or part of a sentence, which has been entered (**Fig 1).**

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Franz's related information translation, with Sukeda's response prediction to allow the user the ability of finding similar/related sentences to express a concept.

As to claim 11, Franz does not teach of a sentence of target language is entered and translated into a sentence.

However, Sukeda teach a sentence or part of a sentence of target language is entered and translated into a sentence or part of a sentence of source language **(two displays for both target and source language, Fig. 1, 102 and 103).**

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use Franz's translation database with Sukeda's dual language input display of both languages for fast linkage between the translations of both languages.

As to claim 16, Franz does not teach of response is predicted to source/first language sentence entered.

However, Sukeda teaches response is predicted in response to said source language sentence or part of a sentence entered, and a response prediction information generated is presented means **(Fig 1).**

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Franz's translation processes, with Sukeda's response

prediction to allow the user the ability of finding similar/related sentences to express a concept.

As to claim 17, Franz teaches related information in the translation information corresponding to source language sentence or part of sentence entered (**Examiner reads 'related information' as "converting part", along with all the input & output components to the converting part, see Fig. 5, steps 7-13).**

Franz does not teach response prediction information that includes at least a response sentence as related information.

However, Sukeda teach response prediction information includes at least one of a response sentence described (**Fig 1).**

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Franz's related information translation, with Sukeda's response prediction to allow the user the ability of finding similar/related sentences to express a concept.

As to claim 28, Franz teaches
input means for entering a sentence or a part of a sentence of target language
(**more than one input means to detect voice or character recognition col. 8, lines 45-46);**
storage means for storing a translation information containing a description of

correspondence between a sentence or part of a sentence of target language **(Fig 16, step s63)** and a sentence or part of a sentence of source language sentence as a translation thereof **(steps 61-72)** and a description of a related information **(converting part)** associated with the sentence or part of a sentence of target language and the sentence or part of a sentence of source language **(Fig 8A-10C, shows “converting part” of the clause ‘If possible’);**

analysis means for deciding according to the translation information stored in second storage means **(second storage can be voice or character, both are stored. “Simple syntax analyzing processing part” divides first language and with help from the “converting part” detects phrase example in second language, col. 10, lines 12-20), a coincidence or similarity between target language sentence or part of a sentence (“converting part” also controls a similarity degree calculating part, which calculates word similarities and meaning between words in example stored, col. 10, lines 20-24)**

target language sentence generation means for generating a sentence or part of a sentence of source language as a translation of target language sentence or part of a sentence **(the phrase compounding part is the means to generate source language as a translation of target language, col. 19, lines 22-30);**
and

output means for outputting said source language sentence or part of a sentence generated by second target language sentence generation means **(source language sentence is first language, if input uses a voice**

recognition device then the output responds the same way that it is entered, col. 8, lines 37-39).

Franz does not teach of a second input means.

Sukeda teaches a second input for storage, input, and output means and for generating means for part of sentences (**col. 3, lines 51-52; col. 23-25; and Fig. 1, 102-103).**

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use Franz's translator with Sukeda's second input, storage, and output means for generating translation for faster translation between users of difference languages.

As to claim 33, Franz does not teach a response prediction.
response prediction means for predicting a response to source language sentence or
Sukeda teaches a part of a sentence entered by input means (**Fig 1**); and
response prediction presentation means for presenting the response prediction
information generated by response prediction means (**Fig 1**).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Franz's translation processes, with Sukeda's response prediction to allow the user the ability of finding similar/related sentences to express a concept.

As to claim 34, Franz does not teach a response prediction.

Sukeda teaches a response prediction information includes at least one of a response sentence described as related information in the translation information corresponding to source language sentence or part of a sentence entered by input means (**Fig 1**).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Franz's translation processes, with Sukeda's response prediction to allow the user the ability of finding similar/related sentences to express a concept.

5. Claims 29-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Franz (6,393,388) in view of Sukeda (5,854,997) in further view of Okajima (4,730,270).

As to claim 29, Franz teaches related information is an information for correlating to the translation information associated with a sentence or part of a sentence of second input means (**more than one input means for voice or character recognition col. 8, lines 45-46**) as a response to source language sentence or part of a sentence which has been entered input means (**Fig 5**).

Franz does not teach target language having a high possibility to be entered next based on the previous input.

However, Okajima teach target language having a high possibility to be entered next (**target language displayed based on previous input, Fig 5**).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Franz's translation based on similar words, with Okajima's target sentence prediction to enhance the users ability in finding similar/related ways to express a user's need, or general concept/idea.

Okajima and Franz do not teach of a second input means.

Sukeda teaches of a second input for storage, input, and output means and for generating means for part of sentences (**col. 3, lines 51-52; col. 23-25; and Fig. 1, 102-103**).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use Franz's translator with Sukeda's second input, storage, and output means for generating translation for faster translation between users of difference languages.

As to claim 30, Franz teaches related information is a field information (**Fig 5 and 8A, and col. 7, lines 64-65 and option of more than one input means for voice or character recognition col. 8, lines 45-46**).

Franz does not teach a high prediction of the next word entered as it correlates to the translation based on the input or field limitations.

However, Okajima teaches limiting a field of a sentence or part of a sentence of said source language (**cancellation/correcting source language by limiting field, col. 7, lines 43-44**), having a high possibility to be entered next in response to source language sentence of part of a sentence which has been entered (**source sentence collected based on previous input, Fig 5, col. 5, lines 54-55**).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Franz's related information and Okajima's limiting field capability for features that enables user's to correct data entered.

Okajima and Franz do not teach of a second input means.

Sukeda teaches of a second input for storage, input, and output means and for generating means for part of sentences (**col. 3, lines 51-52; col. 23-25; and Fig. 1, 102-103**).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use Franz's translator with Sukeda's second input, storage, and output means for generating translation for faster translation between users of difference languages.

6. Claims 10 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Franz (6,393,388).

As to claim 10, Franz teaches a step of deciding whether a translation result candidate of said source language sentence or part of a sentence entered satisfies said application constraint, **(Examiner reads 'application constraint' as one of the processes conducted by the "converting part", similarity degree calculating part, which detects the highest likelihood of the example phrase which meets translation suitability, col. 15, lines 40-47; col. 21, lines 16-19 and Fig 11)**

Franz does not teach reporting source language sentence or part of a sentence that cannot be translated when no candidate satisfies application constraint.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to report missing data or data that doesn't satisfy application constraint to communicate to the user which data is not applicable.

As to claim 27, Franz teaches application constraint decision (**similarity degree calculating part**) means for deciding whether application constraint is satisfied (**translation suitability by calculating word similarity and other parameters**) by a translation result candidate (**translation example**) for source language sentence or part of a sentence entered by input means (**second language**), (col. 15, lines 37-47)

Franz does not teach an information is output indicating that source language sentence or part of a sentence cannot be translated when application constraint decision means decides that no candidate satisfies said application constraint.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to report missing data or data that doesn't satisfy application constraint or translation similarity to communicate to the user which data is not applicable to communicate to enter a different word/phrase or sentence.

7. Claims 13, 15, and 31-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Franz (6,393,388) in view of Okajima et al. (4,730,270) .

As to claim 13, Franz teaches related information is a field information (**Fig 5 and 8A, and col. 7, lines 64-65 and option of more than one input means for voice or character recognition col. 8, lines 45-46**).

Franz does not teach a high prediction of the next word entered as it correlates to the translation based on the input or field limitations.

However, Okajima teach limiting a field of a sentence or part of a sentence of said source language (**cancellation/correcting source language by limiting field, col. 7, lines 43-44**), having a high possibility to be entered next in response to source language sentence of part of a sentence which has been entered (**source sentence collected based on previous input, Fig 5, col. 5, lines 54-55**).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Franz's related information and Okajima's limiting field capability for features that enables user's to correct data entered.

As to claim 15, Franz teaches related information is an information (**Fig 5 and 8A, and col. 7, lines 64-65**) for correlating to the translation information associated with a sentence or part of sentence of source language (**cancellation/correcting source language by limiting field, col. 7, lines 43-44**) and voice recognition (col. 8, line 37)

Franz does not teach a high prediction of the next word entered as it correlates to the translation based on the input or field limitations.

However, Okajima teach having a high possibility to be entered next to source language sentence or part of a sentence which has been entered (**source sentence collected based on previous input, Fig 5, col. 5, lines 54-55**), and according to related information, an information is generated to limit a sentence or part of a sentence of source language (**cancellation/correcting source language by limiting field, col. 7, lines 43-44**) and Okajima teach limiting a field of a sentence or part of a sentence of said source language (**cancellation/correcting source language by limiting field, col. 7, lines 43-44**)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Franz's related information and Okajima's high probability for features that enables user's to correct data entered.

As to claim 32, Franz teaches related information is an information for correlating to a translation information associated with a sentence or part of a sentence of source language (**cancellation/correcting source language by limiting field, col. 7, lines 43-44**) the apparatus further comprising voice recognition object limit means for storing an information limiting a sentence or part of a sentence of source language to be handled by voice recognition means (**storage means for part of sentence/phrases/clauses, Fig 1, 5 and 16**).

Franz does not teach target language having a high possibility to be entered next.

However, Okajima teach high possibility to be entered next to source language sentence or part of a sentence, which has been entered by input means **(target language displayed based on previous input, Fig 5)**.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Franz's translation based on similar words, with Okajima's target sentence prediction to quickly aide a user in related concepts which creates a smoother translation process.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure as follows:

Sukeda et al. (5,854,997) teach pictorial/image drawing, more then one user interface.

Golding (EP 0953918A2) teach translation which reports system failures and continual updating feature.

Asano et al. (5,991,721) teach examples stored, displays sentences that are related to input (Fig 3).

Greene Jr. et al. (6,377,925) teach multiple input and output translator system.

Waibel et al. (5,885,000) teach speech recognition input and error correction.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Myriam Pierre whose telephone number is 703-605-1196. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday – Friday from 5:30 a.m. - 2:00p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Talivaldis Smits can be reached on 703-306-3011. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information As to the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MP

09/15/04


RICHEMOND DORVIL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER